

REMARKS

In this paper, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 12, 14 and 16 are currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-16 are pending.

Claims 2, 5, 7, 12, 14 and 16 have been amended to overcome the objections noted by the examiner.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lin (US 5,690,410). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the computer housing includes a front surface that faces primarily forwardly and not downwardly and a beveled portion extending rearwardly from the front surface. Lin neither discloses nor suggests such a structure.

Claim 5 has been amended to clarify that a same lighting device provides backlighting for the display as well as lighting outside of the computer housing. Lin neither discloses nor suggests such a structure.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Sun, et al (US 5,477,425). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 has been amended to clarify that the display housed within the computer housing is inclined rearwardly. Lin discloses a display that faces upwardly, and Sun, et al are not concerned with a display. Thus, neither Lin nor Sun, et al discloses or suggests the presently claimed invention.

Claims 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Baker (US 3,792,307). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

As for claims 9-14, both the battery and the circuitry in Baker are disposed in the same housing (13), and the same is true in Lin. Thus, neither reference discloses or suggests a separate battery housing spaced apart from the computer housing as recited in claims 9 and 13.

As for claims 15 and 16, Baker teaches separating all of the lighting elements (11, 12, 16, 17) from the circuitry disposed in housing (13). Thus, Baker actually teaches away from providing two lighting elements wherein one lighting element is mounted in the computer housing and the second lighting element is mounted separately.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE
P.O. Box 69
Klamath River, California 96050
(530) 465-2430